UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 120—PART 31

DECEMBER 19, 1974 TO DECEMBER 20, 1974
(PAGES 41021 TO 42229)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1974

the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. LAXALT) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 578 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Aiken	Griffin	Nunn
Allen	Hansen	Packwood
Bartlett	Hart	Pearson
Bayh	Haskell	Pell
Bennett	Hatfield	Proxmire
Biden	Hathaway	Randolph
Brooke	Helms	Roth
Buckley	Hollings	Schweiker
Burdick	Hruska	Scott, Hugh
Byrd, Harry F., Jr.	Huddleston	Scott, William L.
Byrd, Robert C.	Humphrey	Sparkman
Cannon	Inouye	Stafford
Chiles	Javits	Stennis
Clark	Kennedy	Stevens
Cotton	Long	Stevenson
Cranston	Magnuson	Symington
Curtis	Mathias	Taft
Dole	McClellan	Thurmond
Domenici	McGee	Tower
Dominick	Metzenbaum	Tunney
Eagleton	Mondale	Weicker
Fannin	Montoya	Williams
Fulbright	Moss	Young
Gravel	Muskie	
	Nelson	

NAYS—4

Abourezk	McClure	Metcalf
Hartke		

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Hughes, against

NOT VOTING—23

Baker	Eastland	Mansfield
Beall	Ervin	McGovern
Bellmon	Fong	McIntyre
Bentsen	Goldwater	Pastore
Brock	Gurney	Percy
Case	Jackson	Ribicoff
Church	Johnston	Talmadge
Cook	Laxalt	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during the debate on the trade reform bill (H.R. 10710), I expressed strong opposition to section 408 placing restrictions on Czechoslovakia and urged that it be deleted. Consequently, I am most disappointed that restrictions remain in the bill after Senate passage even though in modified form.

I think it is unfortunate for the bill to discriminate as it does against the Czechoslovak people, with whom Americans have always had such close and friendly ties despite the governments or administrations that come and go.

Between the great wars, the Czechoslovaks made their country a showpiece for the democratic process as providing maximum material benefits with minimum restrictions on individual freedom. We sorrowed with them when Munich destroyed their nationhood. We admired their struggle against Nazi occupation and rejoiced when after World War II, national independence seemed to have been restored. Our regret was great when Czechoslovakia fell behind the Iron Curtain. We shared the hopes and brightening prospects in 1968 of the Prague Spring soon blighted, however, by a Moscow winter despite heroic Czech resistance.

The point I wish to make is that while I am all for getting the most favorable settlement possible for American claimants, the beneficiaries of section 408, I do not think that the trade bill, dealing as it does with much broader national interests between peoples, is the place to do it.

Twice now Czechoslovakia has negotiated in good faith to reach a claims settlement, to which we have attached a really irrelevant condition, the return of gold originally seized by the Nazis and belonging to the Czechoslovak people. We now ask that a third attempt be made.

In the light of this background, I urge a generous interpretation of section 408 and that progress toward a new settlement not be held up by negotiations involved in the implementation of the trade bill itself. I think we owe as much to our national reputation for fair dealing and out of consideration for the legitimate rights of our friends, the Czechoslovak people.

THANK YOU FROM SENATOR BENNETT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have 1 minute. I simply wish to use it to express my appreciation to my colleagues for the kind things they said yesterday about my service to the Senate, which will end this afternoon when the Senate adjourns sine die.

I am happy that my last activity has been on this monumental trade bill, which I hope the Senate will accept.

TIME LIMITATION AGREEMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the social services conference report there be a 10-minute time limitation to be equally divided between Mr. LONG and Mr. CURTIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will be in order.

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDING OFFICER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLURE). The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, in accordance with Public Law 85-474, appoints the following Senators to attend the Interparliamentary Union Meeting on European Cooperation and Security, to be held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, January 31-February 7, 1975: The Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, may we proceed with the conference report? The Senators are waiting.

SOCIAL SERVICES AMENDMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on H.R. 17045, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17045) to amend the Social Security Act to establish a consolidated program of Federal financial assistance to encourage provision of services by the States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recomment to their respective Houses this report, signed by all the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, generally speaking, we succeeded in getting the House to accept major items in the social services bill pretty much in line with the way the Senate recommended it. The conference report is a compromise but, I think, a good compromise from the Senate's point of view.

The enactment of this social services measure, Mr. President, is the culmination of a great deal of work by the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE). Early in 1973, when social services first became an issue, Senator MONDALE showed his leadership in proposing legislative solutions to the problems. The fact that we are today sending a bill to the President is largely due to his efforts, and I think that all persons receiving social services, as well all States, localities, and organizations providing those social services should be well aware of his responsibility for our reaching a legislative solution. He is a valuable member of the Committee on Finance, and was a valuable Senate conferee.

Mr. President, the Senate amendment to H.R. 17045 had three parts. The first part represented a substitute for the House bill dealing with social services under the Social Security Act. The second part provided a tax credit for low-income workers with families. The third part contained provisions for a strengthened Federal and State role in child support collections.

So far as social services are concerned, the conferees examined the issues in detail and reached what seems to me to be a fair, reasonable, and workable compromise. Basically, we agreed to follow the lines of the House bill, but we made some important changes which strengthen that bill considerably.

For example, the House bill had no provision for mandatory services to the

aged, blind, and disabled. We wanted to be sure that these people were assured of a fair share of social services money, so the conference bill includes the Senate provision requiring the State to provide at least three types of services for persons receiving supplemental security income benefits.

Another Senate provision agreed to by the conference is for maintaining the provision in present law which requires the States to offer family planning services to AFDC recipients.

With regard to child care, the provisions in the House bill would have resulted in making the cost of care prohibitively high. If care were provided for children under 3, there would have to be one caretaker for every two children. That kind of requirement is totally unrealistic and, if enforced, would result in serious hardship for a lot of people. The conference agreed to have the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare work out regulations for staff ratios for out-of-home care for children under 3, which we would expect to be more reasonable than those in H.R. 17045, as passed by the House. Otherwise, for children age 3 and above, the conference agreed to a compromise we worked out here in the Senate which provides for care meeting the 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, but with some modifications. These modifications ease somewhat the staffing ratios prescribed by those requirements, and provide that the educational content of day care programs is to be recommended rather than mandatory.

The conference agreement also would require the Secretary to issue regulations relating to fees for services for families with incomes below 80 percent of the State's median income. These regulations are to be written in such a way that they will treat families fairly and equally, regardless of their welfare status.

The Senate version also prevailed with regard to certain requirements on the States for reporting and evaluation procedures. We will require the States to report on the use of their social services funds, but they will not be burdened with excessively detailed reporting requirements.

The Senate amendment providing for new social services funding for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands also was accepted in principle, although specific limits are included in the bill.

The effective date for the new social services program is delayed 3 months to October 1975 with the HEW regulations suspended accordingly until that time.

I am pleased that the House conferees were able to accept virtually the entire part of the Senate bill dealing with child support. The House insisted on the deletion of the authority granted to HEW to establish regional blood laboratories which would have supplied expert evidence of blood typing in the determination of paternity. Also, the House did not accept the specific designation of a new Assistant Secretary for Child Support in HEW, but did retain the concept of a separate organizational unit, reporting directly to the Secretary, to administer the Federal aspects of the program. The final change in the Senate bill authorizes the use of the Internal Revenue Service collection mechanism for delinquent child support payments only in the situation where there is a court order involved.

The program adopted by the conference is a major step in the elimination of a national disgrace in the nonenforcement of child support responsibilities. This situation has greatly increased welfare costs by forcing families of runaway fathers on AFDC. The conference bill builds on the Social Security Act Amendments of 1967 which required State programs of child support and determinations of paternity. HEW administration of these provisions has been half-hearted with the result that only a handful of States have established effective programs.

The conference bill will require State implementation of child support programs upon penalty of a reduced Federal matching for AFDC. At the Federal level there will be established in HEW a Parent Locator Service. The use of Federal courts and IRS collection mechanisms where State action has failed is also authorized. At the local level the AFDC recipient assigns his support obligation to the State for collection. This is the procedure that has been used in the States with the most effective child support programs. The Federal matching for these programs has been increased from 50 percent to 75 percent and a special incentive bonus will go to the localities making the actual support collections.

Also of great significance are the provisions in the conference bill which authorize access to support collection services for families not on welfare who have been deserted.

Mr. President, I am extremely disappointed that the House conferees proved so adamant that we were forced to drop the provision of the bill for a tax credit for low-income workers with families. In my opinion, Mr. President, this is an idea whose time has long since come. The Senate has passed that provision three times now, with the thought in mind that we should do what we could to help the working poor. Our bill would have helped an estimated 3½ million families with children by giving them up to $400 a year on the basis of their earnings under social security.

I believe it is important that the Congress take action to help those poor people who are working hard to help themselves, and I believe the Senate bill represents the best action that anyone has proposed up to now. However, there was just no budging the House conferees on this matter and in the interest of legislating this year in these two other highly important areas of social services and child support, the Senate conferees reluctantly agreed to send the bill on to the President without the tax credit provision.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt the conference report.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very gracious comments. I was grateful to work with the distinguished chairman in the development and final resolution after several years of this knotty and difficult question of social services regulation. I think we have come up with a very sound proposal, one which I believe is strongly supported by the Governors, the Commissioners of Welfare, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But it could not have happened without the leadership, the commitment, and the concern of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

I was very pleased to work with him on this proposal, and pleased to have had the opportunity to work with him in the committee and on the conference.

Mr. President, I am pleased to report that the social services provisions of the pending conference report reflect the basic principles of S. 4082, the Social Services Amendments of 1974—which I introduced in the Senate with Senators BENTSEN, PACKWOOD, and JAVITS—and which passed the House as H.R. 17045. I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Senate conferees, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), for his generous cooperation in securing adoption of these provisions.

These provisions—a new title XX to the Social Security Act—were the result of months of hard work and compromise among the National Governors' Conference, the American Public Welfare Association, the AFL–CIO and UAW, and others. The final bill received the full support of the administration.

I hope and believe this new legislation will establish sound ground rules for this program, which is the largest source of federally assisted day care for children, and which also provides special help for the elderly and disabled, alcoholism and drug rehabilitation, and a host of other services directed toward preventing welfare dependency, avoiding unnecessary institutionalization, and strengthening family life.

Basic responsibility for program administration will rest at the State level, as in the past—with strong new provisions to assure both public accountability and accountability to the Federal Government for the use of funds.

I am particularly pleased with the new eligibility requirements, which will open participation in child care and other services to moderate-income families on a reduced-fee basis, while assuring that a substantial share of services must be directed toward the poor. Too often programs for the poor alone suffer from poverty themselves at budget time. And too often we have ignored the crying needs of hard-working, tax-paying families, who struggle to make ends meet and who deserve a helping hand.

And while I regret that the day care standards contained in S. 4082 have been eased with respect to adult/child ratios, I am pleased that for the first time Federal standards for day care—including requirements for parent involvement, health and safety standards, staffing, and the provision of social services to children—now have the force of statutory law. These standards now can and must be enforced.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the cosponsors of S.

4082 may appear at this point in the RECORD, together with a history of the social services controversy prepared by the Senate Finance Committee staff, and the text of the new title XX reported from conference.

There being no objection, the list of cosponsors, the history of the social services controversy, and the text of new title XX were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COSPONSORS OF S. 4082, THE SOCIAL SERVICES AMENDMENTS OF 1974

Senators Packwood, Bentsen, Javits, Brock, Burdick, Case, Clark, Hatfield, Hathaway, Hughes, Humphrey, Mathias, Metcalfe, Ribicoff, Schweicker, Scott (Pa.), Tunney, Williams, Beall, Abourezk, Brooke, Eagleton, Kennedy, Moss, Montoya, Pell, Percy, Church, Hart, Muskie, and McGovern.

SOCIAL SERVICES

LEGISLATION IN 1972

Rapid rise in Federal funds for social services.—Like Federal matching for welfare payments, Federal matching for social services prior to fiscal year 1973 was mandatory and open-ended. Every dollar a State spent for social services was matched by three Federal dollars. In 1971 and 1972 particularly, States made use of the Social Security Act's open-ended 75 percent matching to increase at a rapid rate the amount of Federal money going into social services programs.

The Federal share of social services was about three-quarters of a billion dollars in fiscal year 1971, about $1.7 billion in 1972, and was projected to reach an estimated $4.7 billion for fiscal year 1973. Faced with this projection, the Congress enacted a limitation on Federal funding, as a provision of the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972.

Federal funds for social services limited in 1972.—Under the provision in the 1972 legislation, Federal matching for social services to the aged, blind and disabled, and for services provided under Aid to Families with Dependent Children was subjected to a State-by-State dollar limitation, effective beginning fiscal year 1973. Each State is limited to its share of $2,500,000,000 based on its proportion of population in the United States. Child care services, family planning services, services provided to a mentally retarded individual, services related to the treatment of drug addicts and alcoholics, services provided a child in foster care, and (under a provision adopted last year as part of Public Law 93–66) any services to the aged, blind, or disabled can be provided to persons formerly on welfare or likely to become dependent on welfare as well as to present recipients of welfare. At least 90 percent of expenditures for all other social services, however, have to be provided to individuals receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Until a State reaches the limitation on Federal matching, 75 percent Federal matching continues to be applicable for social services as under prior law. Family planning services provided under the medicaid program are not subject to the Federal matching limitation.

Services necessary to enable AFDC recipients to participate in the Work Incentive Program are not subject to the limitation described above; they continue as under prior law, with 90 percent Federal matching and with funding of these services limited to the amounts appropriated. Federal matching for emergency aid (including social services) is at a 50 percent rate.

REGULATORY CHANGES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

On May 1, 1973, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued sweeping revisions in the Federal regulations under which social services programs are operated by State welfare agencies. These regulations, which were to have become effective on July 1, were strongly opposed by many groups and individuals who felt that they were in many respects contrary to the purposes which social services programs were intended by Congress to serve.

Eligibility for services.—Under the May 1 regulations, social services could have continued to be provided to cash assistance recipients and to former and potential recipients; however, the definition of former and potential recipients was considerably narrower than under the prior regulations. Services provided to former recipients would have had to have been provided within three months after assistance was terminated (compared with two years under the former regulations). Persons could have qualified for services as potential recipients only if they were likely to become recipients within six months and only if they had incomes no larger than 150 percent of the State's cash assistance payment standard. In the case of child care services, potential recipients with incomes above that limit but not more than 233⅓ percent of the cash assistance payment standard could have qualified for partially subsidized child care. Under the former regulations services could be made available to individuals, likely to become recipients within five years and without any specific income tests. The former regulations also permitted eligibility to be established for some services on a group basis (for example, services could be provided to all residents of a low-income neighborhood). The new regulations would have not permitted group eligibility but would have required the welfare agency to make an individualized eligibility determination for each recipient of services.

Scope of services.—The May regulations would have limited the type of services which may be provided to 18 specifically defined services and would have limited to just a few services those which the States are required to provide. By contrast, the former regulations had a fairly extensive list of mandatory services, specifically mentioned a number of optional services, and allowed States to receive Federal matching for other types of services not spelled out in the regulations.

Procedural provisions.—The May 1 regulations would have changed a number of the administrative requirements imposed upon the States in connection with services; for example, the requirement of an AFDC advisory committee would have been dropped and the requirement of recipient participation in the advisory committee on day care services would have been eliminated. Similarly, a fair hearing procedure (as applicable to services) would no longer have been mandated. The regulations would have required more frequent review (every 6 months rather than each year) of the effectiveness of services being provided and would have required that agreements for purchase of services from sources other than the welfare agency would be reduced to writing and be subject to HEW approval.

Refinancing of services.—The May 1 regulations would have denied Federal matching for services purchased from a public agency other than the welfare agency under an agreement entered into after February 15, 1973 to the extent that the services in question were being provided without Federal matching as of fiscal year 1972. This limitation on refinancing of previously non-Federal services programs would have been relaxed under the new regulations over a period of time and would have ceased to apply starting July 1, 1976.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO POSTPONE NEW REGULATIONS

Because of the extensive nature of the changes which would have been made by the new regulations and the issues raised by those changes, the Congress did not have sufficient time to develop a legislative resolution of the policy issues before the new regulations were to go into effect on July 1, 1973. Instead, the Congress simply provided that no new social services regulations (other than those needed for technical compliance with the law) could become effective prior to November 1, 1973. This legislation did allow the possibility of implementing new social services regulations prior to the November 1, 1973 date, if the Administration obtained approval for any such regulations from the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means. Though revisions in the regulations were proposed in the Federal Register in September, no attempt was made to obtain approval of new regulations from the two committees.

REVISED REGULATIONS

On September 10, 1973, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare published in the Federal Register a number of revisions in its earlier proposed regulations. Additional changes were made on October 31, 1973, when the Department published in the Federal Register the final set of regulations, which went into effect on November 1, 1973. These changes did, to a certain extent, attempt to meet several of the specific statutory conflicts which were pointed out in connection with the earlier regulations. In particular, those related to legal services, family planning services, services for the mentally retarded, and treatment of alcoholics and drug addicts were brought more in line with statutory provisions. However, the more basic questions raised by the new regulations remained unresolved under the November 1 regulations.

H.R. 3153 AND FURTHER POSTPONEMENT OF REGULATIONS

H.R. 3153.—In the fall of 1973, the Committee on Finance agreed to an amendment to the House-passed bill H.R. 3153 which was designed to resolve the issues raised by the HEW social services regulations. In general, the social services provisions added to H.R. 3153 by the Committee would have retained the provisions of present law requiring States to provide welfare recipients certain types of services (for example family planning services), but would otherwise have given the States wide discretion in the use of available social services funds. The Committee recommendations were approved by the Senate in passing H.R. 3153, on November 30, 1973. The House conferees, however, were not willing to give immediate consideration to the Senate amendments to H.R. 3153. Legislation was agreed to at the end of 1973 invalidating the HEW regulations which had gone into effect on November 1, and prohibiting those or any other new social services regulations from becoming effective prior to January 1, 1975. Since that time the House conferees have not agreed to resume the conference on H.R. 3153.

H.R. 17045.—On December 9, 1974, the House of Representatives passed a new social services bill, H.R. 17045, which would amend the Social Security Act by adding a new title XX, dealing with social services.

The House bill creates a new title XX of the Social Security Act which establishes a new administrative framework for social services involving the development of annual State plans for services which must meet a number of requirements. HEW would monitor the compliance of these plans with the requirements of law and the compliance of the services program with the provisions incorporated by the States in their annual plans.

COMPARISON OF SOCIAL SERVICES PROVISIONS: PRESENT LAW, COMMITTEE AMENDMENT, HOUSE BILL

Present law	*Committee amendment*	*House bill*
1. AUTHORIZATION		
Provides for Federal matching for State expenditures for social services up to an annual ceiling of $2,500,000,000. Services for families are authorized as a part of the public assistance AFDC program under title IV–A of the Social Security Act; services for aged, blind, and disabled are authorized under title VI.	Same as present law. do	Same as present law. Eliminates services authorization in titles IV–A and VI and substitutes an authorization under new title XX.
2. ALLOTMENT TO STATES		
Provides for allocation of funds (within $2,500,000,000 ceiling) among the States on the basis of State population.	Same as present law, except also provides for *reallocation* of unused funds among States which can use them.	Same as present law.

LIMITS ON ELIGIBILITY FOR SOCIAL SERVICES FOR NON-RECIPIENTS OF WELFARE

[For 4-person families]

State	Social Services May Be Provided to Families With Incomes up to:[1] Without fee[2]	If fee is charged
Alabama	$9,530	$13,699
Alaska	12,908	18,555
Arizona	10,904	15,675
Arkansas	8,830	12,694
California	12,004	17,256
Colorado	10,959	15,754
Connecticut	12,604	18,118
Delaware	11,402	16,391
District of Columbia	10,711	15,397
Florida	10,462	15,039
Georgia	10,190	14,648
Hawaii	12,398	17,823
Idaho	9,928	14,272
Illinois	11,999	17,249
Indiana	11,222	16,132
Iowa	10,608	15,249
Kansas	10,422	14,982
Kentucky	9,349	13,569
Louisiana	9,569	13,755
Maine	9,641	13,859
Maryland	12,060	17,336
Massachusetts	11,816	16,986
Michigan	12,034	17,298
Minnesota	11,293	16,233
Mississippi	8,730	12,549
Missouri	10,691	15,369
Montana	9,939	14,288
Nebraska	10,190	14,649
Nevada	11,722	16,850
New Hampshire	10,987	15,794
New Jersey	12,434	17,874
New Mexico	9,616	13,824
New York	11,792	16,952
North Carolina	9,752	14,019
North Dakota	9,458	13,596
Ohio	11,417	16,412
Oklahoma	9,844	14,151
Oregon	10,980	15,783
Pennsylvania	11,429	16,430
Rhode Island	11,046	15,879
South Carolina	9,620	13,829
South Dakota	9,335	13,419
Tennessee	9,494	13,646
Texas	10,468	15,047
Utah	10,397	14,946
Vermont	10,266	14,757
Virginia	10,674	15,344
Washington	11,583	16,650
West Virginia	9,280	13,341
Wisconsin	11,289	16,228
Wyoming	10,442	15,010

[1] Source: House Report on H.R. 17045. According to the House Report: "This is illustrative only, as there are a number of statistical mechanisms which should be explored." The limits specified in the bill (80 percent and 115 percent of State median income) are not available on a year-by-year basis. Accordingly, the amounts would have to be projected from 1970 census data. The bill does not specify the method of projection or the year to which they are to be projected. The figures in this table were developed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by adding to the 1970 census data for each State the dollar amount of the increase in national median income between 1969 and 1973. Another illustrarive table issued by the Department uses the procedure of increasing 1970 census data by the percentage increase in national median income between 1970 and 1973.

[2] Limited to 100 percent of national median income, which for 1973 was $13,710.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, before acting on the conference report, I believe the RECORD should show that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN) made a very fine contribution in sponsoring the initial child support legislation which resulted in large measure in what we have before the Senate now. I believe we will make great progress in child support thanks to the efforts of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN).

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

I have a question of Senator LONG. I join with Senator MONDALE in the approval of what was basically done, that is No. 1.

Second, I think the reallocation provision is very constructive. We fought for that for a year. We could not get it, and so much money needs to be allocated, about $1 billion a year, but it really is a measure of justice which has finally been consummated.

Mr. President, I shall vote for adoption of the conference report on H.R. 17045, the Social Services Amendments of 1974, notwithstanding certain reservations, so as to provide a new legislative framework for social services programs, rather than to start all over again next year, introducing new elements of uncertainty into a situation which has been "up in the air" for too long.

The conference agreement is basically a sound proposal in terms of social services deriving a number of provisions from the House bill, which in turn meet the objectives of S. 4082, the Social Services Amendments of 1974, which Senator MONDALE and I introduced with a number of other Senators on October 3.

These provisions include increased flexibility on the part of the States in the choice of services, relaxed eligibility requirements, and a number of other provisions designed to make it more possible to reduce welfare dependency, without sticking so strictly to welfare eligibility standards as the administration's proposed regulations had proposed as to be counterproductive.

Similarly, I am pleased that the conference report retains the provisions in the Senate passed bill providing for reallocation of funds from States which do not use allocations to States, like my State of New York, that have great needs, have been put in a straightjacket under the very prejudicial allocation formula imposed under the $2.5 billion social services ceiling; since 1972, New York State has been held to $220 million per year—against needs of approximately $800 million—while unused funds have ranged from $700 million to $1 billion nationally over each of the last 2 years; this conference bill would correct that through reallocation provisions similar to those I have fought for over these years, expressed most recently in S. 4119, the Emergency Social Services Amendments of 1974, which I introduced on October 10.

I am, however, deeply concerned about the provisions of this legislation that relate to child care standards. Most deeply troublesome are the provisions that would raise the ratio of adults to children from the current 1 to 10 ratio contained in the Federal interagency day care requirements, to a ratio of 1 to 15 for children age 9 or younger, and to a ratio of 1 to 20 for children aged 10 to 14. The implications of this ratio increase are quite severe given the experience we already have with non-Federal programs that have not been subject to standards.

So I would like to ask the Senator whether there is anything in the report which would prevent a city, a State or some other political subdivision or an individual or other charitable contribution from trying to add and supplement for the lack of care which may result from the application of this new standard which, by the way, is a minimum standard, and I just want to be sure that there could be fed into it improvement from governmental or private sources.

Mr. LONG. Yes, they can do that.

I might mention that the one-fifteenth staff-to-children ratio applies only for children ages 6 to 9. For children under age 6, the staffing requirements are higher. Furthermore the way it stands now, though we have higher staffing requirements for children 6 and over than in this bill, they are not being enforced.

This bill provides a standard that we believe is going to require upgrading of child care staffing around the country, which we hope will be enforced.

So we are trading off an impractical standard, not observed in practice around the country, for what we think is one more feasible, which we hope will be observed.

Mr. JAVITS. Nonetheless, if an individual entity or individuals who wish to contribute, cooperate, or whatever, wish to help out, they may, there is nothing to inhibit them under the law?

Mr. LONG. Nothing whatever.

Mr. JAVITS. I am also concerned about the section of this provision that would eliminate the requirement that the States provide educational services under the Federal interagency day care requirements. Under this legislation, those formerly mandated services would now be merely recommended to the States.

I hope that the Senate will be most diligent in exercising its oversight responsibilities in this area and that we will most carefully monitor the effects of these changes on the quality of services provided to young children under this legislation.

I would further emphasize that this increase in the ratio of adults to children and relaxation of the requirements for the offering of educational services, applies only to those programs which function under this specific social security legislation. The Federal interagency day care standards are not themselves in question here. The standards will continue to apply completely to the Head Start program and child care provided under ESEA.

Despite my strong reservations about certain provisions of this bill, I believe on balance that it is a sound measure and I would urge each of my colleagues to support its enactment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. NUNN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. Yes, I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. NUNN. I would like to thank Senator LONG, chairman of the Finance Committee and the committee staff, for their excellent work which has culminated in this legislation on "runaway" parents in the AFDC programs.

This bill represents a humane approach and one that will be extremely beneficial.

It could not have been passed without the superb effort of Senator LONG and the Finance Committee staff, particularly Mike Stern. Although I introduced the legislation, it passed on the efforts of the committee and the leadership.

I believe this bill will make a very positive correction to a problem that continues to plague our country.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as one of the Senate conferees on this important social services legislation, I want to express my satisfaction over its having been brought before us for final action. I know there was some question as to whether H.R. 17045 would "make it through" before adjournment, all of which were characterized by a true spirit of compromise and cooperation—making it possible.

While there are many among us who do not necessarily champion every cause which will be aided through enactment of this bill, I think we have all maintained an awareness of the necessity for constructive and timely improvements in the current system. I consider it very significant, too, that all who have been involved in the development of these proposed program changes are uniformly in support of the new approach being offered.

These include the relevant congressional committees who have been studying the existing problems; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which has been charged with supervisory authority; the National Governors' Conference, which represents the State commissions implementing the affected programs; and a coalition of key organizations concerned with services for children, families, the aged, and the disabled.

We have been witnessing a virtual impasse during the last 2 years over the regulation of Federal social services grants. But now, finally, we will have the legislative guidelines necessary to bring efficiency and effectiveness into the respective State administrations.

As a strong believer in the concept of local decisionmaking, I am confident that we will soon witness a new responsiveness on the part of the States in addressing the needs of their citizens. At the same time, I feel certain we will see an improved public reaction to the types of programs covered by the $2.5 billion in annual grants provided in the measure.

In that regard, I would urge every State to take full advantage of the matching funds opportunity presented here to further expand and enhance their own projects. During the last year, for example, my own State of Kansas made use of only about $10 million of the $27 million available to them for those purposes.

I am aware of numerous other States which experienced similar substantial "losses"—just through the inability to raise their required one-fourth share. That should no longer be the case, however, with the new incentives being created by H.R. 17045 in the form of broad operational discretion.

Mr. President, while this conference report will be among the last items we consider in this Congress, it is by no means a product of anything other than thorough and careful study of the entire problem area. For that reason, we can take great pride in adding it to our list of legislative achievements for 1974.

We have a worthwhile, and indeed essential, proposal here which deserves our unanimous endorsement. It will provide the vehicle we need to bring both flexibility and accountability into a troubled social services system, and I am hopeful that we can send it to the White House by an overwhelming margin.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, in the conference report on H.R. 17045, the Social Services Amendments of 1974, the conferees, unfortunately, acted to eliminate the Federal requirement for an educational component in child care programs. Although most of the other social services provisions of the conference report represent a step forward, elimination of the required educational component is a troublesome one to me.

I would strongly urge that, when the Congress reconvenes, we give immediate consideration to reinstituting all provisions of the Federal interagency day care requirements—including the mandate for an educational component—to be required of all States operating child care programs with Federal funds.

In 1972, the California Legislature and the Governor assigned the responsibility for all child care programs to the California Department of Education. Under the leadership of our very able State superintendent of public instruction, Wilson Riles, the department has carried out its mandate of providing child care programs with a strong and very valuable educational component for more than 50,000 children. California's child care programs have become a model for similar efforts across the country, as evidenced by what I understand are hundreds of inquiries which come in each month from individuals and groups in other States. In California, there is broad-based support from thousands of parents and numerous organized parent groups for a strong educational base in child care programs.

It is apparent that California's efforts in education-based child care can show the way for a national movement in child care aimed at insuring high-quality developmental child care programs that go well beyond simple custodial supervision or babysitting services. This positive movement must go forward and be promoted by restoring a Federal requirement for an educational component in child care in the social services program.

These developmental experiences for young children are critical, and I plan to urge reconsideration early in the 94th Congress of the Federal mandate for all provisions of the Federal interagency day care requirements.

Mr. President, I do want to thank the distinguished Finance Committee chairman (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), and the other conferees for accepting the reallocation which I added as a floor amendment on H.R. 3153 a year ago and which will be of substantial benefit to the people of California.

Mr. LONG. I believe, Mr. President, that this measure will increase the income of the poor with children to support.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 696—PROVIDING FOR CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 10710

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message on House Concurrent Resolution 696.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 10710.